DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 963 CS 209 989

AUTHOR Mueller, Roseanna M.
TITLE Teaching Writing through Literature: Toward the Acquisition of a Knowledge Base.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-West Regional Conference on English in the Two-Year College (21st, St. Louis, MO, February 13-15, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College English; Cultural Awareness; English Curriculum; Higher Education; *Knowledge Level; *Language Processing; *Literature Appreciation; Prewriting; Problem Solving; Reader Response; Reader Text Relationship; Reading Comprehension; Reading Skills; *Reading Writing Relationship; Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges; *Writing Instruction; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Reader Based Teaching (Literature); *Teaching Writing through Literature

ABSTRACT

Teaching literature as a basis for teaching writing affords a paradigm for teaching structure and meaning. While a truly integrated English department would put equal emphasis upon composition, language, literature, and reading, two-year college curricula have emphasized composition and challenged literature's place. A reader-based model for teaching literary texts decentralizes the lecturer's role while helping the student make observations and inferences within a discourse of knowledge. Problem solving, comprehension, and cultural literacy must be taught within a content area, not as discrete exercises. Scholars argue that teaching writing while confronting literary text would bring together the technical skills of composition, the cultural knowledge within the linguistic form, and the cultural content literature has to offer. Recent research supports this argument. Sharing first drafts and using summaries as focusing exercises encourage the habit of frequent writing. Literacy depends on specific, finite, sometimes superficial knowledge. There are many reasons to include literature in two-year college curricula so that students, rather than being assigned exercises in writing, can be taught to respond to a unified method of reading and making meaning of what they read. (A list of journals reviewed in "College English" is appended. Endnotes and a 52-item bibliography are also provided.) (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273963

TEACHING WRITING THROUGH LITERATURE: TOWARD THE ACQUISITION OF A KNOWLEDGE BASE

DR. ROSEANNA M. MUELLER

PRESENTED AT THE MIDWEST REGIONAL COUNCIL
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
ST.LOUIS, MO.
FEBRUARY 13-15, 1986

THIS STUDY WAS MADE POSSIBLE THROUGH THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
SUMMER SEMINARS FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

RoseAnna Mueller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 209 969

Abstract

MIDWEST REGIONAL COUNCIL,NCTE
FEBRUARY 14,1986
ST.LOUIS,MO.

"TEACHING WRITING THROUGH TEACHING LITERATURE:
TOWARD THE ACQUISITION OF A KNOWLEDGE BASE"

ROSEANNA M. MUELLER
MORTON COLLEGE
CICERO,IL.60650

Many of us are restructuring our curricula to teach critical thinking skills. While some of the emphasis on critical thinking is a response to the 1983 study " A Nation at Risk ", current research in cognitive development would show that reading, writing, problem solving and critical thinking are not generic skills. These interrelated skills must be taught within specific domains of knowledge. At the same time, we are being urged to raise the level of cultural literacy in our students, which depends on extensive knowledge acquired through wide reading over a period of time, and familiarity with the canons of a common core of agreed-upon knowledge.

A dangerous rift, however, has arisen which has tried to separate the teaching of literature and the teaching of composition. A movement to keep literature out of the composition class threatens to decrease students' familiarity with the theories of literature, literary study, and language theory. Writing in response to literature, as opposed to teaching literature as literary criticism will help students produce observations and make inferences within a specific discourse of knowledge. Keeping the student's needs in mind, focusing on reader response, appealing to the students' intellectual development, and encouraging students to manipulate the text demonstrates that preparing to write about literature is preparing to learn organization, structure and analysis-- skills basic to all writing.

Teaching writing through teaching literature gives students a rich and valuable knowledge base and brings together the technical skills of composition and the cultural content of literature. The future of literature in the composition class will depend on how we approach the related areas of reading, writing, and critical thinking. We can integrate literature and writing by teaching them as learning activities that foster communication, cultural literacy, and critical thinking skills. A strong case must be made for teaching literature, for its relevance in the "real world", and for the contribution it can make in sharpening critical thinking skills.

Teaching Writing Through Literature:

Toward the Acquisition of a Knowledge Base

Finally! A chance to tell you what I did on my summer vacation. Much of what I would like to share with you today is based on readings and discussions which formed the basis of an NEH seminar, Composition: Style and the Nature of Discourse, given by Joseph Williams at the University of Chicago. During this seminar, I became aware of the current rift between the teaching of writing and the teaching of literature. I directed my reading to those articles that try to reconcile this separation and point to ways in which literature can be used as a knowledge base in the writing class.

Perhaps the real issue we need to address is, "What is the future of the teacher of literature at the two-year college?" You may be aware that a battle is currently being fought. Some see themselves as teachers of literature, having studied literary history and literary criticism. Others see themselves as teachers of composition, having been trained in the research and teaching of writing. Frederick Crews suggests that one camp cries MLA, to which the other camp replies CCCC.[1]

The breach widens, but the history of that breach is relatively new. Those who are concerned with the future of literature in particular and liberal arts in general will have to find a way to narrow this gulf since in reality, literature and composition cannot be separated either in theory or in

teaching practice, but are rather opposite sides of the same coin.[2]

Departments of English Literature have existed since about 1880; Departments of English and American Literature since about 1930. Little by little, these departments became increasigly fragmented into departments of speech, logic, journalism, comparative literature and communications. We need ways to reintegrate our methods since our goals are to teach composition, language, literature and reading. J.N. Hook foresees the birth, or rebirth, of an ideal department in which literature has an honored but not dominant role.[3]

This new department must integrate several ways of teaching literature and writing to meet the needs of our changing student population so that the teaching of literature is not so much the central issue, but rather a means to an end—a contribution to the general education and liberal learning of our students. A movement from training in literature towards training in communications can only lead to a reduction of student's familiarity with the canons of literature.[4]

But a truly integrated Department of English will deal equally with composition, language, literature and reading. According to the ADE 1981-1982 Writing and Literature Survey, 75% of community college instruction is in writing, with 11% instruction in literature and 13% devoted to "other." The teaching of literature, nationwide, took up only one-third of the typical English Department.[5] The reason was that as writing courses became more popular, with increased teaching loads in classes such as technical writing, business and professional writing, advertising, and creative writing, literature offerings suffered a decline.

Working backwards in time, in a 1974 ADE Study of Freshman English, there was a marked de-emphasis on literature. The rationale offered in that study was that more time was needed to spend on practical skills.[6] In his

Presidential Address to the MLA in 1977, Alan Hollingsworth argued for a "Composition program embedded in a sufficiently rich matrix of literature, literary criticism and language study or students would risk being cut off from the insights of hundreds of years of literature, literary study and language theory."[7]

Today, the pendulum may have swung to the point where it seems like heresy to introduce literature into the composition class. "Many modern composition specialists see any study of high literature in the freshman program as an attempt by professors trained in criticism to evade the alien discipline of composition teaching."[8]

Listen to the rationale offered by one writing teacher on the dangers of what happens when a composition teacher "sneaks" literature into the classroom. It leads one to think that the teacher is seducing his students with pornography. "Literature is so attractive to the typical English teacher and can be made so attractive to the student that it often turns out to be a distraction from the main objective of a composition course, which is to teach students how to write the kind of utilitarian prose they will be asked to produce in their other college classes and later on in their jobs. The class then becomes primarily a workshop in how to read a poem or a play, or a novel or a short story. Before long the writing class has turned into a seminar in literary criticism."[9]

He continues in this vein, speaking of the need to keep teachers "on target", keeping them from "bootlegging literary texts into the course", and of instructors who fall prey to the "siren call of literature." Straying from the objectives of the course is considered an "aberration" and literature itself become a "temptation that is dangled before our instructors."

This line of reasoning, it seems to me, is valid only if we are trying to

protect our students from encountering literature before they are prepared to read it. If we cannot prepare them properly at this stage in their intellectual careers, who can? Or perhaps it assumes that some other kind of writing exercises need to be performed before the student can encounter a text. Or perhaps we fear that the person who teaches the composition class is really trained as a literary critic and cannot deal with the theory of teaching writing, which only recently has gained status as a respectable discipline.

If those ADE reports are true, then who has been teaching those newly popular writing classes? Can the literary critics teach writing? That question seems to be at the heart of the issue. But those very teachers are also accused of being unable to teach literature in a meaningful way, if they continue to teach literary criticism as they themselves were taught it. If this is so, then their classes may consist of a more-or-less passive audience, sitting while the teacher, as master-reader, master-critic, shows what he knows, displays his own critical skills, explains meaning, wittingly or otherwise, to his students.[10] The first counter-productive habit we can break as teachers is not to give our own accounts of the text, but allow the student to become a bona-fide reader and interpreter.

How, then, teach literature? What is its proper role in the curriculum of the two-year college? Whether they occur in a community college or in a four-year college, the first two years of college are crucial.[11] In the undergraduate sequence the first two years stand at the center of the educational experience. They are, as Richard Lanham says, the aim towards which the high school curriculum builds. From them, the specialized major departs. In the community college the first two years represent, for some, the last chance for a formal education. It would be very easy for us to construct a case around the argument that reading the classics, or high literature, helps

our students become better writers. But unfortunately, that is not a valid statement.

Why not just content ourselves with teaching the established composition courses and let it go at that? And why do the established composition courses prove to be a series of disjointed excercises that fulfill the requirements of a syllabus? Often, the essays in our rhetoric readers are construed by students as scattered bodies of knowledge. They find it difficult to respond to the essays. Some students may never see even those essays, since the "text" for class discussion is the material written by other students.

In an attempt to make the writing class more palatable, some instructors argue that literature has too much power to be subordinated to student writing in class work. They claim that the group itself is the producer of literature. Marie Ponsot and Rosemary Deem use this approach. "When we say that our students' writing is literature, we are asked, 'How do you define literature?' Here the definition is simple. What we pay attention to is literature. Our paying attention to it and the kind of attention we pay to it helps make it literature."[12]

Literature provides a rich knowledge base. School districts, colleges and universities are restructuring their curricula to teach critical thinking skills. The good news is that critical thinking can be taught. The bad news is that all recent studies in cognitive development suggest that critical thinking must be learned in context, with a knowledge of, and experience in, a specific field. "Improvement in the field skills of learning, such as required on aptitude and intelligence tests, takes place through the excercise of conceptual and procedural knowledge in the context of specific domains." [13] Combining the teaching of writing while confronting a literary text, would, as E.D. Hirsch, Jr., writes, bring together the technical skills of composition

and the cultural knowledge within the linguistic form and cultural content literature has to offer.[14] Futhermore, by using suggestions and techniques that are described in the many journals devoted to the teaching of writing, it becomes evident that it is possible to use literature without subordinating the teaching of writing to the study of literature per se.

The freshman composition course as it is sometimes taught today seems designed to frustrate both student and teacher. If we concede that critical thinking skills are based on both knowledge and experience, what knowledge and what experience does the average freshman bring with him to the college?

How realistic are the assignments that are forced out of students in an attempt to teach them the paradigms presented in the composition books? How many more times can we read a three-page paper on cooked-up subjects? J. Hillis Miller acknowledges the huge burden placed on writing teachers under the current system. "Most teachers of composition no doubt find themselves again and again in the somewhat embarrassing situation of teaching not just grammar and rhetoric but also logic, ethics, politics, and even something of theology and the music of the spheres."[15] The solution seems obvious--have the teacher teach the subject matter that forms his own knowledge base.

"To the degree that we have a choice of what we teach, we should try to devise courses around subjects that in themselves contribute to that special kind of hard thinking that is good writing."[16] Wayne Booth's recommendations for teaching what he refers to as LITCOMP successfully point the way toward a reintegration of literature and composition. His list includes:

1. the writing of frequent papers
2. instances of writing, rather than excercises in writing
3. critical responses from readers the students respect
4. small course loads
5. mechanisms that allow students to address each other
6. instructors who have taken instruction in writing
7. reading a wide range of literature.

These suggestions touch on most of the ideas currently under discussion. We know that our incoming freshmen are not used to writing. We also know that we are teaching students for whom English is, or is like, as Booth notes, a second language. There are no quick fixes to this problem, and the solution is to force students to write more. It doesn't matter that it may be someone else's fault that they haven't written more in the past. The answer is to make sure they get as much practice in reading and writing as they can now.

Mina Shaunnessy, writing about the challenges she encountered as she taught the first students under the City University of New York's Open Admissions Program, cites a number of problems that won't go away. Students do not write frequent or long papers in high school. "They have been writing infrequently, and then only in such artificial and strained situations that the communicative purpose of writing has rarely if ever seemed real."[17] To some of them, the act of simply pushing a pencil across a sheet of blank paper is a task in itself.

As these freshmen move into the college curriculum, there is very little guarantee that they will be forced to write more frequently, or to use those skills they have learned in their composition classes. Colleges concerned with this issue have taken steps to implement a writing across the curriculum approach. But it remains clear that if the student sees no relationship between the kind of work he is required to produce to pass the typical Freshman Composition course and the amount of reading and writing he is expected to do in his other courses, he will not be stimulated to write in depth. He will take the course and get it over with. The lesson is driven home further if the tests the student takes contain no essay questions and if he is never asked to write another paper for his other courses.

When we communicate the habit of frequent writing to our students, we

must be careful that we do not expect perfectly polished pieces, for therein lies our own frustration. We must encourage them to keep journals, to get into the habit of sharing their pre-writing, and to explain that revision means just that--re-seeing the work, not merely changing a few words. There is value to having the work judged by peers, who may offer further insights and make suggestions which the student can then act upon. His work will have some significance to someone other than his English teacher. The teacher must act as facilitator and is responsible for fostering a climate of trust and respect. There is also a value to the kind of writing that helps the student as he charters new universes of discourse. Often, this kind of writing takes the shape of a chronicle, as the student explains how he came to see what he now knows. The student must instatiate knowledge before he can substantiate it and manipulate a new body of material.

What some teachers may brusquely dismiss as "mere summary" is the end result of a complex series of operations. While summaries are not ends in themselves, they are valuable focusing exercises. Recent research confirms that reading and writing are similar, if not identical, mental operations.

Various proponents of reader-based theories refer to a kind of thinking and writing process that is a necessary step to writing. This kind of thinking and pre-writing has been given various names. Lev Vygotsky refers to it as "inner speech."[18] Linda Flower calls it "writer based prose."[19] David Bleich calls it "resymbolization."[20] Peter Elbow, a long-time proponent of freewriting as a liberating excercise calls it "first-order writing.[21] These theories argue that readers process experience through personal associations, prior cognitive schemes, and personal memories. This kind of reading and writing represents a valid and necessary first step that leads to finished prose. Sharing first responses, no matter how crude, and first drafts, no

matter how sketchy, serves as a springboard for the thorough development of more finished pieces. Students' responses to the text become the basis for work which unifies writing, reading, thinking and interpretive abilities.[22] A reader-based approach does not argue that the end product be "feelings", but it argues that inner response and reaction is a desirable starting place.

Response to literature can be taught as a hierarchy of steps, moving from reader response to noting given information in the text. From this point, the student can move to searching for implied information, and searching for generalizations.

A real-life activity could involve the use of summary and reactions beginning as a simple focusing exercise and moving to more generalized and complex applications. Take, for example, the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, a novel taught in many American Literature classes,, and currently back in the headlines. The first step might be to have the student summarize the novel, or parts of it, or to describe characters in the novel as though he were writing a letter to a friend. The second step might involve having the student come up with his own summary that will serve as a personal study guide. From there, he might summarize an aspect of the novel to demonstrate his understanding of it to his intructor or to his classmates. He might be given this "real-life" assignment:

> The Board of Education at your local high school is aware that some school districts are claiming that this novel should be removed from the shelves. How would you summarize Huckleberry Finn for this audience, and how would you persuade them to keep it or remove it?

In each instance, the student must change his tone, his approach, his overall rhetorical skills and critical thinking skills in order to suit his audience. He is asked to manipulate knowledge as he becomes more familiar with both the work and its analysis.

Perhaps the composition class as we know it in the two-year college

should be saved for the sophomore year. It could then serve the student better if only for the simple reason that the sophomore will have lived a year longer and learned a year's worth of knowledge. Lacking that knowledge, not knowing how to read analytically, we should not be surprised when students are literally at a loss for words both in class and on paper.

Using a reader-based model for teaching literary texts is one way to avoid turning a writing class into a class on literary criticism. Using a reader-based model induces students to produce their own reactions rather than having to listen to what their instructor knows. By decentralizing the role of the lecturer, we fulfill Booth's third criterion. We provide a basis for shared conversation. We give the students a voice in the class, an opportunity to respond to their thoughts while getting feedback from both their colleagues and their intructor.

In most two-year colleges, students will not take Introduction to Literature. But Writing Through Literature may help develop composition skills. Properly taught, this class could dispel the misconception that literature is wrought with hidden meanings and that the teacher has cornered the market on the author's intentions. Writing in response to literature uses literature as a stimulus that leads to inner responses. It creates relationships between reader and text, reader and reader, and reader and teacher. This helps the student produce observations and make inferences within a discourse of knowledge. And that is the goal of critical thinking.

Reading and writing skills can be taught without turning a class into a series of lectures on literary criticism. This approach at least ensures that students have something they can take with them at the end of the course, even if it is merely an insight into the literary aspects of our culture. Crews asks, "After a composition class, do we have a group of writers before us? We

have experimental subjects who have provisionally mastered several useful techniques but who still lack the integration skills that makes for permanent gains. If we are aiming at something more than what the educationists call 'exit' behaviors we should at least...give our students a close encounter with shrewdly chosen readings." He continues, "Students [in a composition class] often need to be coaxed into making an initial response from which a thesis could be developed. But even the wariest among them can find in literature a preformed world, full of images, stories, and enacted values that intersect their lives in any number of ways."[23]

Teaching literature as a basis for teaching writing affords a paradigm for teaching structure and meaning. Elaine Maimon, concerned with issues of writing across the curriculum, bases her work on the assumption that the forms of writing within a particular intellectual community manifest modes of thinking within that community.[24] Students should be encouraged to enter the community of academic and public conversation to help keep the greater conversation of culture going.[25]

Literature is a highly valued part of our culture, as are the other branches of the humanities. Literature can help students learn to read in a rewarding way, so that they come to understand that there are many modes of discourse. By learning to read literature, by wrestling with the human concerns it presents, they may enhance their powers of analysis. Literature provides a framework of reflection, contemplation and insight and may point the way for students to continue their own self-education.

You may be familiar with the move toward cultural literacy--the shared values, conventions, and knowledge bases that help a reader to construct meaning from a text. Reading skills, like writing skills, vary from task to task. "The idea that reading is a general, transferable skill unrelated to subject

matter is essentially wrong."[26]. No writer ever starts from scratch—his readers, must, to a greater or less extent, "fill in" meanings to the text. Sociolinguists and psycholinguists knew this twenty years ago. A writer who has been truly socialized into his discipline knows the tacit conventions, that which he is allowed to leave out, counting on his readers to reconstruct knowledge as they read the text. Those students who score higher on the verbal SAT's do so because they have acquired knowledge through wide reading in many domains over a period of time. Cultural literacy, then, is defined as "the knowledge that enables a writer or reader to know what other writers or readers know within the literate culture."[27]

Other research in cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence shows that knowledge is at the base of all problem solving. The teacher's task is to discover what knowledge is needed for a class of tasks and to discover how to communicate that knowledge effectively to his students.[28] Other related studies argue that readers are constantly being asked to bridge inferences through what are referred to as schemas or scripts. One simple example involves the following story:

"John was feeling very hungry when he entered the restaurant. He settled himself at a table and noticed that the waiter was nearby. Suddenly, however, he realized that he'd forgotten his reading glasses."

What inferences have we bridged? How do we know that John must read a menu? Because we have knowledge of, and experience in, what goes on in a restaurant. As Robert P. Abelson states, we have a prepared script.[29] We modify that script for trips to McDonalds and trips to restaurants where the script calls for making a reservation. Similarly, cultural literacy forms a kind of script. In a more complex illustration, Hirsch quotes the following excerpt from the Washington Post.[30]

A federal appeals panel today upheld an order barring foreclosure on a Missouri farm, saying that U.S. Agriculture Secretary John R. Block has

reneged on his responsibilities to some debt-ridden farmers. The appeals panel directed the USDA to create a system of processing loan deferments and of publicizing them as it said Congress had intended. The panel said that it is the responsibility of the agriculture secretary to carry out this intent "not as a private banker, but as a public broker."

A culturally literate person, argues Hirsch, will understand this text as a whole. Since the newspaper reporter cannot provide all the necessary background, much of the schema, or filling in, depends on knowing information such as, "Who gave the order that the federal panel upheld?" and, "What is a federal appeals panel?" Even if the reader understood each word in the text, he could not understand the text, because he lacks all the background information that should form the necessary background knowledge of a truly literate American.

Literacy depends on specific, finite, sometimes superficial knowledge. Informed readers fall back on this body of knowledge constantly. Hirsch, with the help of an historian and a natural scientist, has drawn up a list of background knowledge people need to have by the time they graduate from high school. The list includes pre-1865 people such as John Adams, Benedict Arnold, Daniel Boone and John Brown. It includes the large realm of allusion that belongs to our literary and mythic heritage and forms a shorthand for writers, such figures as Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, Humpty Dumpty, Jack and Jill, Achilles, Adonis and Aeneas.

I began by saying that critical thinking, as much as we would like to have it otherwise, is not a generic skill. Nor is reading and writing. Problem solving, comprehension, and learning are based on knowledge. People continually try to understand and think about the new in terms of what they already know.[31] Critical thinking, problem solving, reading, comprehension, and writing skills must be taught within a content area and not as discrete excersises. Teaching literature as a knowledge base and using literature for

writing assignments doesn't guarantee that this skill will transfer to another area. Each subject area presents students with its own set of knowledge, with its own form of discourse. Why then, teach writing through literature?

Two-year colleges have made a commitment to educate, and not just train their students. If we want to be here asking the question, "What is the future of literature in the two-year college?" a few years from now, we will have to make a strong case for including literature in the curriculum now, if only to keep our own conversations going.

Robert Scholes would have us move literature down from its reverential status and teach it because our "current students are part of a manipulative culture--deprived in experience in the thoughtful reading and writing of verbal texts. They need knowledge and skill that will allow them to make sense of their worlds...to see through the manipulation and learn to express their own views."[32] He continues, "A writing approach to literary texts, in which students write in the forms they are reading, or use such texts as intertexts for writing in other forms, not only will improve their ability to write in all forms of discourse, but will also improve their ability to read and interpret texts."[33]

Perhaps our reasons for wanting to make room for the study of literature may be explained in political, cultural,and economic terms, and I am sure each of you here could produce the standard five-paragraph paper on those reasons. Ultimately, the real reason cannot be explained in any logical manner. It may have to be couched in emotional terms. Richard Lanham, who has grappled with the literacy crisis caused in part by our radically changing student population, suggests that this crisis "...may redeem both our teaching and our research and put literary study back in the center of modern humanism where in our hearts we know it belongs."[34] By putting literature back into the writing

class, we give students a rich and valuable knowledge base. We give them unified texts to respond to, and a basis on which to respond.

Rather than assigning students exercises in writing, we can teach them to respond to a unified method of reading and making meaning of what they read. We will have to change the way we as teachers approach literature, dropping our reverential relationship to it, as Scholes puts it. We can assist in the evocation of a piece, which is the personal reaction of reader and text, rather than moving quickly to the teaching of the traditional critical baggage of graduate schools--genre, comparative themes, biographical concerns, or social analysis.[35] It may mean that teachers of literature may have to go back to the drawing boards and learn to become teachers of writing. Likewise, teachers of writing may learn to overcome their reluctance to use literary texts in class.

In effect, the first composition course should be an education in reading and writing. We can continue to teach the clarity/brevity/sincerity approach that often is its goal.[36] We can integrate literature and writing by teaching them both as a learning activities that foster communication and critical thinking skills.

Can teaching literature as a basis for writing assignments help? Would we rather correct and discuss papers based on real responses? Or to papers thrown together simply to please us, which allow the student to become "immunized" to the course? Can exposing our students to literature help? Do we think it would hurt?

How can we accomplish these objectives? We would not be alone in meeting them. One of the newest and fastest growing groups within the MLA, the traditional literary association, is the Division of the Teaching of Writing.

Since the '70s, a number of journals whose central concerns are the ones we are exploring today have been established (see Appendix). The articles in these journals offer case studies, lesson plans and overviews of research being done in this area.

Many of the responses to the ways in which reading and writing are taught have been based on research conducted during the past decade. Much of our concern with cultural literacy and critical thinking is a reaction to the 1983 study "A Nation at Risk." It is this constant reaction to the changing needs of those whom we teach that makes teaching the stimulating job some of it find it to be. Those of us who value literature, who do not want to see our students leave our institutions without an appreciation for it, will find ways to integrate literature and writing to help create a unified and coherent educational experience. We should re-examine the motives which led to the movement to separate language skills that in every way depend on each other. The motives are political, social, economic, philosophical and sexual.[37] We will have to make changes in our departments, in our programs and curricula, and in our classes, for that is where our own future lies.

APPENDIX

The following journals were reviewed in College English 46, April, 1984.

Freshman English News (1970)

Teaching English in the Two-Year College (1974)

Journal of Basic Writing (1975)

Teaching Writing (1976)

Writing Lab News (1976)

Writing Program Administration (1977)

Journal of Teaching Writing (1979)

The Writing Instructor (1979)

Writing Center Journal (1980)

Journal of Advanced Composition (1980)

Rhetoric Review (1982)

Written Communication (1984)

NOTES

[1]"Composing our Differences: The Case for Literary Readings," Composition and Literature, ed. Winifred Bryan Horner, p. 159. See also Art Young, "Rebuilding Community in the English Department," Profession 84, (MLA 1984) pp. 24-32. for his explanation of the rift.

[2]Winifred Bryan Horner, "Historical Introduction," Composition and Literature, p. 2. Horner offers some historical background to the rift between the teaching of literature and the teaching of English as communication.

[3]"College English Departments: We May Be Present at Their Birth," College English 40 (1978), p. 270.

[4]David H. Fowler and Lois Josephs Fowler, "Literary Studies and Communication Skills: Separation or Reconciliation? English Journal 73 (March 1984), p. 43. The authors offer further historical background on the schism and their solution to the problem.

[5]Art Young, "The 1981-82 Writing and Literature Survey: Courses and Programs," ADE Bulletin 73 (Winter 1982) pp. 53-57.

[6]Page Tigar, "ADE Survey of Freshman English," ADE Bulletin 43 (Nov. 1974) pp. 15-23.

[7]"Beyond Survival," Profession 77 (New York: MLA, 1977).

[8]Patrick G. Scott, "'Flowers in the Path of Science': Teaching Composition Through Traditional High Literature," College English 42 (1980) p. 3.

[9]Edward P.J. Corbett, "Literature and Composition: Allies or Rivals in the Classroom?" Composition and Literature, ed. Horner, p. 181. Corbett concludes the two are rivals and should be taught as mutually exclusive subjects.

[10]Geoffrey Summerfield, "Literature Teaching and Some of Our Responsibilities," New Essays in the Teaching of Literature: Proceedings of the Literature Commision, Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, Sydney, Australia, 1980, p. 121.

[11]Richard Lanham, "Composition, Literature, and the Lower-Division Gyroscope," Profession 84 (New York, MLA) pp. 10-11. Lanham also addresses the historical split, but argues that although composition, journalism, and rhetoric went their own ways, they were never able to establish themselves as independent areas of inquiry.

[12]Marie Ponsot and Rosemary Deem, Beat Not the Poor Desk, Montclair, N.J., Boynton/Cook, 1982, p. 70

[13]Robert Glaser, "Education and Thinking: The Role of Knowledge," American Psychologist, Feb. 1984, p. 99, and John E. McPeck in Critical Thinking and Education, St. Martin's Press, 1981. McPeck says that critical thinking always manifests itself in connection with some identifiable activity or subject area and never in isolation. p. 5.

[14]"Reading, Writing, and Cultural Literacy," Composition and Literature, ed. Horner, p. 147

[15]"Composition and Decomposition: Deconstruction and the Teaching of Writing," Composition and Literature, ed. Horner, p. 40.

[16]"LITCOMP: Some Rhetoric Addressed to Cryptorhetoricians about a Rhetorical Solution to a Rhetorical Problem," Composition and Literature, ed. Horner. pp. 61-62. See also "The Common Aims that Divide Us; or, Is There a Profession 81," Profession 81 (MLA, 1981) pp. 13-17. See also "Presidential Address: Arts and Scandals 1982" (MLA, 1982) pp. 312-322.

[17]Errors and Expectations, (New York, Oxford U. Press, 1977), p. 14.

[18]Thought and Language, trans. Eugenia Hanfman and Gertrude Vakar (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962), p. 149.

[19]Linda Flower, "Writer Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing," College English, 41 (1979), pp. 19-37.

[20]David Bleich, Subjective Criticism, (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1978) passim.

[21]Peter Elbow, "Teaching Thinking Through Teaching Writing," Change, Sept. 1983, pp. 37-40.

[22]Bruce Petersen, "Writing About Responses: A Unified Model of Reading, Interpretation, and Composition," College English 44, 1982, p. 461.

[23]Crews, Composition and Literature, p. 166.

[24]Elaine Maimon, "Knowledge, Acknowledgement and Writing Across the Curriculum: Toward an Educated Community," The Territory of Language: Linguistics, Stylistics, and the Teaching of Composition, ed. Donald McQuade, (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U. Press, 1985) p. 20.

[25]Kenneth A. Bruffee, "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind,'" College English, 46, 1984, pp. 635-52.

[26]E.D. Hirsch, Jr., "Cultural Literacy: What We Need to Know," American Educator, 9 (Summer, 1985) pp. 8-16.

[27]Hirsch, "Cultural Literacy," American Educator.

[28]James G. Greeno, "Trends in the Theory of Knowledge for Problem Solving," Problem Solving and Education: Issues in Teaching and Research, ed. David T. Tuma and F. Reif, (Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum and Associates, 1980) pp. 10-13.

[29]Robert P. Abelson, "Psychological Status of the Script Concept," American Psychologist, Feb. 1984. p. 716.

[30]Hirsch, in "Cultural Literacy," p. 10.

[31]Robert Glaser, "Education and Thinking: The Role of Knowledge," American Psychologist, Feb. 1984. p. 100.

[32]Robert Scholes, Textual Power: Literary Theory and the Teaching of English, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1985. p. 5.

[33]Scholes, Composition and Literature, p. 108.

[34]Richard Lanham, "One, Two, Three," Composition and Literature, p. 29.

[35]Louise M. Rosenblatt, The Reader, the Text, the Poem. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U. Press, 1978) pp. 27-31.

[36]Richard Lanham, "Composition, Literature, and the Lower Division Gyroscope," Profession 84. MLA 1984, p. 13.

[37]Scholes, Textual Power, pp. 6-7. Scholes argues that the greatest value in an English Department is placed on the interpretation of literature, which is performed by the higher paid, predominantly male, tenured faculty. Composition, which produces what he calls "pseudo non-literature," is the work of lower paid, predominantly female colleagues.

Bibliography

Teaching Writing Through Literature:
Toward the Acquisition of a Knowledge Base

Abelson, Robert P. "Psychological Status of the Script Concept." American Psychologist. Feb. (1984), 715-729.

Bleich, David. "Discerning Motives in Language." Composition and Literature: Bridging the Gap. ed. Winifred Bryan Horner. U. of Chicago, 1983, pp. 81-95.

-----Subjective Criticism. Baltimore, Md. Johns Hopkins U. Press. 1978.

Booth, Wayne C. "Presidential Address: Arts and Scandals." PMLA (1982), 312-332.

---- "The Common Aims That Divide Us; or, Is There a 'Profession 81'?" Profession 81, MLA, (1981), 13-17.

____"'LITCOMP': Some Rhetoric Addressed to Cryptorhetoricians about a Rhetorical Solution to a Rhetorical Problem." Composition and Literature, ed. Horner. U. of Chicago Press, 1983, pp. 168-84.

Bramer, George R. "Comp. vs. Lit.--What's the Score?" College Composition and Communication, 28:1 (Feb. 1977), 30-33.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'." College English, 46:7 (1984), 635-651.

Corbett, Edward J. "Literature and Composition: Allies or Rivals in the Classroom?" Composition and Literature, ed. Horner. pp. 168-84.

Comley, Nancy R., and Robert Scholes, "Literature, Composition and the Structure of English." Composition and Literature, ed. Horner. pp.96-109.

Crews, Frederick. "Composing Our Differences: The Case for Literary Readings." Composition and Literature, ed. Horner. pp. 159-67.

Elbow, Peter. "Teaching Thinking by Teaching Writing." Change, (Sept. 1983), 37-40.

Fenstermaker, John J. "Literature in the Composition Class." College Composition and Communication, 28:1 (Feb. 1977), 34-37.

Flower, L. "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Base for Problems in Writing."

College English, 41, (1979), 19-37.

Flower, L. and J. Hayes. "The Cognition of Discovery: Defining a Rhetorical Problem." College Composition and Communication, 31, (1980), 21-32.

Flynn, Elizabeth A. "Composing Responses to Literary Texts, A Process Ap- Approach." College Composition and Communication, 34, (1983), 342-348.

Fowler, David H. and Lois Josephs Fowler. "Literary Studies and Communication Skills: Separation or Reconciliation?" English Journal, 73, (1984), 43-46.

Glaser, Robert. "Education and Thinking: The Role of Knowledge." American Psychologist, Feb. (1984), 93-103.

Greeno, James G. "Trends in the Theory of Problem Solving." Problem Solving and Education: Issues in Teaching and Research, ed. David T. Tuma and F. Reif, Hillsdale, N.J. Erlbaum and Assoc., 1980. pp. 10-13.

Griffin, C. Williams, ed. Teaching Writing in All Disciplines. Josey-Bass, Washington, 1982.

Klaus, Carl H., and Nancy Jones, ed. Courses for Change in Writing: A Selection from the NEH/Iowa Institute. N.J., Boynton/Cook, 1984.

Harp, Richard. L. "Using Elemental Literary Forms in the Composition Class." College Composition and Communication." 29:2 (1978), 158-61.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr., "Reading, Writing, and Cultural Literacy," Composition and Literature. pp. 141-47.

---- "Cultural Literacy." American Educator, 9, (Summer 1985) pp. 8-16.

Horner, Winifred Bryan. Composition and Literature: Bridging the Gap. Chicago: U. of Chicago, 1983.

Hook, J.N. "College English Departments: We May Be Present at Their Birth." College English 40, (1978), 269-73.

Kaufer, David S., and Richard E. Young, "Literacy, Art, and Politics in Departments of English." Composition and Literature, ed. Horner. pp. 148-58

Kurfiss, Joanne. "Intellectual, Psychosocial, and Moral Development in College: Four Major Theories." Project QUE, Council for Independent Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 1983.

Lanham, Richard A. "Composition, Literature, and the Lower-Division Gyroscope." Profession 84, PMLA, (1984), 10-14.

---- "One, Two, Three." Composition and Literature, ed. Horner. pp. 14-29.

____ Literacy and the Survival of Humanism. Yale U. Press 1984 .

Lederman, Marie Jean. "Literature and Composition in the Two-Year College: Love Affair or One-Night Stand?" Teaching English in the Two Year College, 12:1 (Feb, 1985), 9-13.

Maimon, E. et al. Writing in the Arts and Sciences. Cambridge, Mass: Winthrop, 1981.

Maimon, E. "Knowledge, Acknowledgement, and Writing Across the Curriculum: an Educated Community." to appear in McQuade, D. The Territory of Language: Linguistics, Stylistics, and the Teaching of Composition. Southern Illinois U. Press. 1985.

Mallick, David, et al. New Essays in the Teaching of Literature: Proceedings of the Literature Commission, Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, Sydney, Australia, 1980.

McPeck, John E. Critical Thinking and Education. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Perry, William G. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1970.

Petersen, Bruce T. "Writing About Responses: A Unified Model of Reading, Interpretation, and Composition." College English, 44:5 (1982), 459-468.

Petrosky, Anthony R. "From Story to Essay: Reading and Writing." College Composition and Communication, 33 (Feb. 1982), 19-36

Ponsot M. and Deen, R. Beat Not the Poor Desk: Writing: What to Teach, How to Teach it and Why. Montclair, N .J.: Boynton/Cook, 1982.

Prince, Gerald. "Literary Theory and the Undergraduate Curriculum." Profession 84, MLA (1984) pp. 37-40.

Rosenblatt, Louise. Literature as Exploration. 3rd. ed. New York: Noble, 1976.

-----The Reader, the Text, the Poem. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U. Press 1978.

Rumelhart, David E. "Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition." Theoretical Issues in Reading, ed. William Brewer, et. al. Hillsdale, N.J., Erlbaum and Associates, 1981.

Scholes, Robert. Textual Power: Literary Theory and the Teaching of English New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1985.

Scott, Patrick G. "'Flowers in the Path of Science': Teaching Composition Through Traditional High Literature." College English, 42, 1980, pp. 1-9.

Shaughnessy, M. Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing. New York: Oxford U. Press, 1977.

Tigar, Page. "ADE Survey of Freshman English." ADE Bulletin 43 (Nov. 1974), 15-23.

Vygotsky, Lev. S. Thought and Language. trans. Eugenia Hanfman and Getrude Vakor. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1962.

White, Edward M. "Post Structural Literary Criticism and the Response to Student Writing." College Composition and Communication, 35:2 May (1984), 186-95.

Young, Art. "Rebuilding Community in the English Department." Profession 84. MLA (1984), pp. 24-31.

———"The 1981-82 Writing and Literature Survey: Courses and Programs." ADE Bulletin 73 (Winter 1982) 53-57.